DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 887 JC 890 310

TITLE Attrition '89: A Survey of Non-Returning Students in Spring 1989. Research Report 89-04.
INSTITUTION Cumberland County Coll., Vineland, N.J.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Community Colleges; Continuing Education; *Dropout Characteristics; Dropouts; *Enrollment Influences; Followup Studies; Minority Groups; Questionnaires; Stopouts; *Student Attitudes; Student Attrition; *Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

In 1989, a survey was conducted of Cumberland County College (CCC) students who enrolled in fall 1988 but did not return in spring 1989. Questionnaires were mailed to all 718 nonreturning students, requesting information on their educational goals, enrollment patterns, ratings of college services, reasons for not returning, and personal characteristics. Study findings, based on a 34.5% response rate, included the following: (1) 83% of the nonreturning students were enrolled part-time; (2) 58% had employment-related goals, and 71% were employed full time while attending school; (3) in comparison to CCC graduates, nonreturning students made less use of college support services and gave them lower ratings; (4) 16% of the nonreturning students gave financial reasons for not returning, 12.5% listed conflicts with job hours, 11.5% indicated that they had achieved their goal for enrolling, 8% listed personal or family illness or injury, and 6% reported dissatisfaction with course offerings; (5) in comparison with nonreturning students from previous years, fewer 1988-89 nonreturning students dropped out because they had transferred or because they had achieved their goals; and (6) 12% of the fall 1988 entering students were black, compared to 6% of the nonreturning students. The survey instrument is appended. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308887

Attrition '89: A Survey of Non-returning Students in Spring 1989

Research Report 89-04

Prepared by

Office of Planning and Research
July 1989

JC 890 310

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Resnik

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey was conducted of Cumberland County College students who enrolled in Fall 1988 but did not return in Spring 1989. The results of the survey are consistent in many ways with similar community college research reports published in the past two years in the ERIC Data Base and revealed somewhat different findings from a similar survey of the previous semester's non-returning students.

A 34.5 percent return rate was obtained after two mailings to the 718 students identified, or approximately 25 percent of the Fall 1988 class of credit students. The sample was 73 percent female and 86 percent White, and 83 percent of the non-returning students were enrolled part time rather than full time. Most were employed full time, and 58 percent had employment-related goals for enrolling.

A survey of incoming Fall 1988 students revealed that the portion which did not return is different in some ways from the entering cohort. For one thing, 20 percent of the entering cohort said at the time of entry that they did not plan to return for the following semester, and a greater proportion said that their goals for enrollment were transfer.

Students who did not re-enroll were distributed across the programs in much the same proportions as were Spring 1988 graduates, and nearly 65 percent were taking only one course. Non-returning students rated college services slightly differently than did graduates, making less use of many of the services and rating them lower in general.

Students checked their reasons for not returning in order of importance. In general, although they were varied, the reasons clustered in a few areas: conflicting job hours, financial reasons, personal reasons, having met their personal need, and dissatisfaction with course offerings. Fewer students than previously failed to return either because they had transferred or because they had satisfied their personal need.

Certain relationships emerged through cross tabulation of the data. For example, those enrolled in continuing education programs had enrolled for job-related reasons in greater proportion than had those who enrolled in credit courses. Students with employment-related goals do not always enroll in employment-related courses. Students who wished to improve job-related skills enrolled exclusively as part-time students.

Most important were the relationships between sex and enrollment goal and between racial/ethnic background and enrollment goal, which indicate that non-returning students and those who do return have different perceptions concerning goals. These relationships show a need for additional, in-depth research and may indicate a need for different advisement strategies.

The results of this survey, combined with the findings of the survey of students who did not return for the Fall 1988 semester, give a relatively complex picture of the reasons for students' failure to re-enroll from one semester to the next, and both indicate directions for future research.

INTRODUCTION

Each semester in community colleges a number of students who enrolled in the previous semester do not return to college. This failure of students to return resultss in concern about attrition and discussions concerning drop-outs, stop-outs, cool-outs, and other exploration of students' failure to continue their enrollment from one semester to the next. In order to determine reasons for the numbers of students who have not continued their enrollment at Cumberland County College, a survey of non-returning students has been conducted for the past two semesters. This report summarizes the result of the spring survey, with reference to findings of the previous survey, and other research.

Surveys of community college students who choose not to return after one or more semesters have become relatively more frequent in the past three years among community colleges. Findings from these surveys show some interesting consistencies from college to college across the country, as these consistencies are reported in institutional research reports available from the ERIC Data Base.

It is difficult to survey non-returning students because a relatively large number of mail survey forms are undeliverable, addressee unknown. In addition, of those who probably receive the survey form, many do not complete or return it. A recent review of reports on non-returning student surveys in 1987-89 reveals that return rates ranged from approximately 27 percent to 39 percent. Beyond this, those who do not return the form may well represent less typical student reasons for not returning. Most studies seem to show that, although reasons for not returning to college from one semester to the next vary, there are some consistent reasons offered. Employment demands was found by Clagett (1988), to be the most common reason. Cotnam (1988) found that most non-returning students specified that they had not returned because of personal rather than institutional reasons, a finding that is apparently reflected in the responses that students stopped attending because they had achieved their goals or completed the courses they wanted to take (Tichenor, 1987; Lee, 1987). Where data are broken down, these studies indicate that the rate

of non-return is higher for part-time students that for full-time students, and higher for those whose goals are career- or job-related rather than transfer oriented.

METHOD AND SAMPLE

In order to conduct the survey, the questionnaire used in the Fall 1988 semester was revised (copy attached) and distributed to the list of students identified by the Computer Center as students who had enrolled during Fall 1988 but did not re-enroll for Spring 1989. Because continuing education (non-credit) students and credit students were not differentiated on the list, respondents were asked to designate whether they were enrolled for credit or in one of a number of non-credit, continuing education offerings.

The survey was conducted during early Spring 1989 through the use of questionnaires mailed to students on the list. Of the 718 students who were identified as non-returning, 154 returned their questionnaires after the first mailing. When a second mailing was conducted for those who had not already responded, an additional 94 surveys were returned. The response rate, therefore, was 34.5 percent, one that seems to be very much in line with similar studies at other schools across the country. It is also interesting to note that the total Fall 1988 enrollment was 2266; of these, 718 were identified as non-returning students. Despite this, the Spring 1989 total enrollment was 2051. Apparently we are seeing continuing new enrollment despite a large percentage of students who do not return, and of this new enrollment, we do not have the means, currently, to determine and summarize quickly the numbers of students new to the college or those who have returned from some previous semester's enrollment.

It is important to keep in mind that the sample represents 34.5 percent of the total non-returning student population, and that the response data are self-reported with all the biases characteristic of self-reported data. Of course, a certain degree of self-selection is evident, too, among those who chose to return the form. Consequently, students who may have performed poorly may have chosen not to return

the form, thus distorting to some degree the distribution among reasons for students' not returning or perceptions of college services. Despite these cautions, however, the results should be of concern to college personnel.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of the total who responded to the question, 80 percent (185 students) identified themselves as credit students, while 20 percent said they were continuing education students. These may have been ROGATE students, College for Kids students, or students enrolled in other non-credit offerings. Although it is difficult to generalize from the sample to the population in this case, it might be tentatively observed that roughly 574 credit students of the original fall enrollment did not return, or 25 percent of the class.

Student Characteristics

The sample was primarily female: 73 percent. Since the Fall 1988 enrollment figures showed that 69 percent of the student body was female, this indicates that proportionately more females than males either did not return or were inclined to complete the survey. Intuitively, it seems that the latter is more likely. The median age of respondents was 29.

Approximately 16 percent of respondents did not respond to inquiries of a demographic nature, but of those who did, 45.5 percent were single; 40 percent were married, and 13 percent were either divorced, separated, or widowed. Most (56 percent) had no dependents; 31 percent had one or two dependents, 10 percent had three or four dependents, and 3 percent had five or more.

Most non-returning students said they were employed: 71 percent full time and 16 percent part time. An additional 7 percent were unemployed; 5 percent were not employed outside their homes; and less than 1 percent had never been employed. Those working part time worked a mean of 20.8 hours per week. Employment figures indicate some differences from those surveyed last semester, in which only 55 percent worked full time.

The ethnic composition of the group was also somewhat different from the ethnic

composition of the fall enrollees. Non-returning respondents were 86 percent White, 6 percent Black, 7 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian or American Indian. It should be noted that the composition of non-returning students for the previous semester showed different characteristics. The previous group had more dependents, was somewhat younger (median age, 26), and most (56 percent) were single, widowed (1 percent) or divorced or separated (9 percent). Although in the previous group 97 percent had one dependent, it is possible that the difference may reflect a change in the wording of the question.

A Fall 1988 survey of approximately one-third of the registrants indicated that of those who responded, 60 percent were single; 30 percent were married; and 11 percent were either divorced, separated or widowed. Of this same group, 59 percent had no dependents; 29 percent had either one or two dependents; 11 percent had three or four dependents; and 1.5 percent had five or more dependents. The ethnic composition of the Fall enrollees was 78 percent White; 12 percent Black; 8 percent Hispanic; and 2 percent either Asian or American Indian. One can see, therefore, that the group of students responding to the survey is not quite representative of the total. That, in itself, indicates a direction for further research. Table 1 summarizes the differences among the groups.

Student Goals and Enrollment Patterns

According to studies done in other parts of the country, it is the part-time student who is more likely to drop out or stop out (see Head, 1988; Clagett, 1988; Cohen, 1988). Those who did not re-enroll at Cumberland were primarily part-time students, 83 percent. Also consistent with studies done elsewhere, a large proportion of Cumberland's non-returning students identified their original goals as job-related. That is, 58 percent said that their primary goal for enrolling was related to employment: 37.3 percent said that they had enrolled to prepare for employment, and an additional 20.3 percent said they had enrolled to improve their job skills. It is also interesting to note that 11 percent of non-returning students said that their goal in enrolling was to pursue a personal interest, and 6.5 percent

Table 1
Characteristics of Samples

	Spring 1989 non-returning students (%)#	Fall 1988 non-returning students (%)	Fall 1988 registrants (%)
Male	27	30	31
Female	73	70	69
White	86	86	78
Black	6	5	12
Hispanic	7	6	8
Other*	1	1	2
Single+	58.5	66	70
Married	41.5	34	30
Employed full time	71	55	58
One or more dependents	44°	97°	41°

Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding
* Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Asian/Pacific Islander
+ Includes single, divorced, separated, and widowed
° Differences here may be attributable to difference in wording of question.

said they had enrolled to supplement a four-year program in which they were enrolled at another college.

By contrast, the survey of incoming Fall 1988 students showed that their overall goals were somewhat different. Slightly more than 20 percent of the incoming enrollees said at the time of registration that they did not intend to return for the spring semester. In addition, 39 percent of Fall registrants identified transfer to a four-year college as their primary enrollment goal. Also, only 6 percent of Fall registrants indicated pursuit of a personal interest as their primary goal in enrolling, and crosstabulation indicates that a significant 80 percent of these students did not intend to return for the following semester. Table 2 summarizes the differences.

Students who did not re-enroll in Spring 1989 represented program enrollment at Cumberland generally. For example, while 14 percent of the non-returning students had been in the Liberal Arts/Business Program at Cumberland, that represents approximately the same proportion of graduates from that program in the previous year. That is, those programs with disproportionately large numbers of non-returning

Table 2
Enrollment Goals of Students Registering for Fall 1988
and Those Who Did Not Return Spring 1989

	Fall 1988 Registrants (%)*	Spring 1989 Non-Returning Students (%)
Prepare for employment	35	37
Improve current job skills	19	20
Transfer	40	20
Meet people	0.1	1
Personal interest	6	11
Other	1	11+

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding
\+ Includes 6.5 percent who enrolled to supplement a 4-year program.

students are the same programs with disproportionately large numbers of graduates: Liberal Arts/Business, Liberal Arts/General, and Nursing. No program stands out as having an unusually large percentage of non-returning students.

If most non-returning students attended part-time, how many courses were they enrolled in? Most students, 64.5 percent, had taken one course during the last semester in which they were enrolled. The mean number of courses non-returning students had taken in their last semester was 1.5. Only 4 percent of non-returning students said they had taken either four or five courses in their last semester.

Ratings of College Services

Non-returning students were asked to rate college services, as graduates are asked to do. Their responses provide an interesting contrast to the ratings of graduates. In general, non-returning students are less likely than graduates to use certain services and less likely to rate services as highly as do graduates. The Library is one obvious example. Thirty-seven percent of non-returning students said that although they knew the Library existed, they did not use it. Only 3 percent of graduates felt that way. Similarly, while 84 percent of graduates rated the Library as good or excellent, only 50 percent of non-returning students rated it as good or excellent. It is not surprising to find that 66 percent of non-returning students knew about student activities but didn't use them, as opposed to 41 percent of

graduates, but it is interesting that fewer rated student activities as good or excellent (14 percent as opposed to 25 percent). Table 3 shows the non-returning students' ratings of college services.

Table 3
Rating of College Services

Service	Value Rating in Percent*						
	poor	fair	average	good	excellent	didn't know existed	knew about but didn't use
Academic Advisement	5	8	12	25	13	4	34
Admissions	3.5	5	19	38	19	1	14
Counseling	6	6	10.5	15	10.5	3	49
Financial Aid	7	4	7	5	10	2	65
Job Placement	2	2	6	6	2	17	65
Library	1	3	9	30	20	1	37
Registration	3.5	7	21	37	22	.5	9
Student Activities	2	3	10	9	5	4.5	66
Instruction in Major	4	6	9	28	37	4	12
Tutoring	4	2	5	9	7	7	66.5
Learning Lab	1	4	4	17	14	8	53

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Reasons for Not Returning

Students' reasons for not returning varied considerably, but most were clustered in a few areas: conflicts, financial reasons, personal reasons. Sixteen percent of non-returning students gave financial reasons as their most important reason for not returning, a slightly higher figure than that cited during the previous semester. A total of 74 persons said that financial reasons were the first, second, or third most important reason for not returning. The second reason accounting for the non-return of students was a conflict in job hours; this reason was listed as most important by 12.5 percent of respondents, and a total of 78 persons listed it as either first, second, or third in importance. Far fewer students than last semester listed transfer to a 2- or 4-year college as their most important reason for not returning: 5 percent as opposed to 15 percent last semester. This may reflect the difference in enrollment period.

There were three other marked differences in reasons given for not returning

between students who did not return for the spring term and those who did not return for the fall term. One is that the number of students who did not return this spring because they had satisfied their personal need is approximately half the number who did not return last fall. The second is the number dissatisfied with course ofierings: 6 percent this semester who gave this as the most important reason and 3 percent last semester. The third is the number who changed their residence: 5 percent last semester as opposed to 1 percent this semester. Table 4 presents the reasons for students' non-return in Spring 1989.

Table 4
Respondents' Reasons for Not Returning

Reason for Not Returning	Most Important #	Most Important %*	2nd in Importance #	2nd in Importance %	3rd in Importance #	3rd in Importance %
Satisfied personal need	32	11.5	15	5	11	4
Found a related job	5	2	11	4	-	-
Transferred to 2-yr. college	3	1	4	1	1	.4
Transferred to 4-yr. college	10	4	1	.4	1	.4
Currently enrolled in 4-yr. college	6	2	5	2	2	1
Financial reasons	45	16	19	7	10	4
Conflicting job hours	35	12.5	28	10	16	6
Child care problems	5	2	4	1	5	2
Personal/family illness/injury	23	8	13	5	9	3
Transportation problems	4	1	4	1	2	1
Change in residence	2	1	4	2	3	1
Attendance problems	2	1	10	4	9	3
Grade problems	3	1	2	1	5	2
Difficulty in adjustment	1	.4	3	1	5	2
Lack of self-confidence	3	1	6	2	4	1
Lack of support from family, friends	-	-	1	.4	2	1
Lack of college, peer support	-	-	-	-	1	.4
Lack of support from instructors	1	.4	4	1	1	.4
Dissatisfied with course offerings	17	6	11	4	2	1
Dissatisfied with course content	1	.4	10	4	1	.4
Dissatisfied with instruction	7	2.5	4	1	6	2
Dissatisfied with advisement	-	-	3	1	5	2
Other	14	5	-	-	-	-

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Significant Relationships

Cross tabulating the data gives additional insights. Of those who enrolled for credit courses in the Fall 1988 semester (80 percent of all respondents), 56.5

percent had job-related goals. Of those who enrolled in continuing education (non-credit courses), 61 percent had job-related goals, an even larger percent. It is not surprising that of those who enrolled in continuing education courses, 35 percent enrolled to satisfy a personal interest.

It is also interesting, and statistically significant, that of the 45 students who were enrolled in continuing education courses, only 18 percent had originally planned to reach their original enrollment goal by enrolling in continuing education courses.

A cross tabulation of students' primary goal in enrolling with their program reveals that students with employment-related goals do not always enroll in programs leading to employment. For example, about half of those enrolled in the Liberal Arts/General program reported that their original goal was employment related. All of those who were enrolled in the nursing program had employment-related goals. The program with the largest number of enrollees, 12, was Liberal Arts/Business. Students in that program had goals that ranged from transfer and employment to personal interest and an interest in meeting other people. It is not surprising that those who enrolled to improve their job skills enrolled exclusively as part-time students. And it is interesting that 24 students whose goal was future employment enrolled full time.

Cross tabulating enrollment goal with sex shows that there is a statistically significant connection between sex and goal in certain categories. While both males and females in similar ratios listed preparation for future employment as their primary enrollment goal (males 35 percent and females 38 percent), there was a marked difference in the rates at which males enrolled to improve their current job skills (8 percent) and those at which females enrolled for the same reason (24 percent). It is also interesting that although they enrolled at equal rates with the goal of transferring (males 21 percent, females 20 percent), there is a clear difference in the rates at which they enrolled in order to pursue a personal interest: 21 percent for males and 7 percent for females. The two students who enrolled in order to meet

other people were both female. This distribution of the data does not control for credit as opposed to continuing education enrollments, although that may play a role. These data are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Enrollment Goal by Sex: Frequencies

Goal	Male	Female
Prepare for employment	22	66
Improve current job skills	5	42
Transfer	13	35
Personal interest	13	12
Meet people	-	2
Supplement 4-year program	4	11
Other	6	4

It appears that goal for enrollment is related to ethnic background in some way. For example, 35 percent of Whites, 47 percent of Blacks and 50 percent of Hispanics enrolled in order to prepare for future employment; however, of those enrolled in order to improve current job skills, 96 percent were White. Hispanics who did not return were enrolled in order to transfer far out of proportion to their numbers in the college population; for example, 44 percent of the Hispanic non-returning enrollees had enrolled in order to prepare for transfer; and of those who enrolled in order to prepare for transfer, 15 percent were Hispanic, more than double their occurrence in the total number of non-returning students. Also significant is that 93 percent of those who enrolled to supplement a four-year program were White. Please see Table 6 for a summary. Even given concerns about the representative nature of the sample and the cautions appropriate to self-reported information, these findings should be cause for further inquiry about the relationship between racial/ethnic background, appropriateness of enrollment goals, and attrition.

Table 6
Enrollment Goal by Racial/Ethnic Heritage: Frequencies

Goal	Black	White	Hispanic	Other*
Prepare for employment	7	70	8	-
Improve current job skills	2	45	-	-
Transfer	3	38	7	-
Personal interest	2	22	1	-
Meet people	-	1	-	1
Supplement 4-year program	1	14	-	-
Other	-	10	-	-

* Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Asian/Pacific Islander

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although in the previous semester a survey of non-returning students gave a picture of many students whose reasons for not continuing to enroll were personal and while many said they did not re-enroll because they had fulfilled their original intents, those students who did not return in Spring 1988 reveal slightly different responses.

In general, those students who did not return were primarily part-time students and were slightly different in characteristics from the overall fall enrollment profile of students: more heavily female; slightly older; more Whites than minorities. Most were credit students, although 20 percent were enrolled in non-credit offerings. A total of 87 percent were employed, 71 percent full time. Consistent with other community colleges in the country, most non-returning students were part-time students, most taking only one course, and most had employment-related goals. Some seemed to know that they did not plan to continue at the time they enrolled, as another survey of registrants revealed. They were distributed among the college programs in roughly the same percentages as are graduates, and no program stands out as having disproportionately large numbers of dropouts.

In this semester's cohort of non-returning students, more students were dissatisfied with certain college services. Even the library, while rated

positively, was not used as frequently by these students and not rated so highly as it has been by graduates. As revealed by student comments as well as by reasons for not returning, more students said they were dissatisfied with course offerings than had been apparent in the previous semester.

Although many students cited satisfaction of their personal need as their most important reason for not returning, only about half the number of last semester's non-returning students gave this reason. Rather, financial reasons assumed greater importance, as did conflicting job hours and dissatisfaction with course offerings. Personal reasons also accounted for a moderate number of students who did not return. These reasons for not returning, while not accounting for all students, give indications that perhaps more attention should be paid to the problem.

Two findings indicate a need for additional attention and research. One is the sex-related nature of the enrollment goals of students who do not return. The second is the nature of the relationship between racial/ethnic background and enrollment goals for students who do not return. Research in greater depth may contribute to an understanding of the specific need for additional counseling or advisement for part-time students.

Comments of students follow. Although the comments cover a range of reasons for not re-enrolling, a few themes seem to appear:

1. Many students enjoyed their experience and plan to re-enroll at some future time.

2. Some students find that financial circumstances limit their ability to take classes.

3. There seems to be concern about course offerings and scheduling: lack of flexibility or variety in course offerings and time slots.

4. Students have had unpleasant experiences with the responses of college personnel to students' needs.

5. Students have had positive experiences but don't know when their circumstances or jobs will permit them to take classes again.

A copy of the questionnaire is also attached.

References Cited

_____. "Drop-Ins or Drop-Outs: A Study of Student Attrition at John Tyler Community College, Winter Quarter 1987 to Spring Quarter 1987." ERIC Document 300081, 1987.

Clagett, Craig A. "Student Retention at Prince George's Community College." ERIC Document 300101, 1988.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Trends and Issues in Community Colleges, 1988: Minority Student Transfer." ERIC Document 293588, 1988.

Cotnam, John D., and Sherrill Ison. "A Follow-Up Study of Non-Returning Students." ERIC Document 291435, 1988.

Head, Ronald B. "Quarterly Student Retention at Piedmont Virginia Community College, 1987-88." ERIC Document 301302, 1988.

Lee, Beth S. "Measures of Progress, 1984-1987: A Four-Year Retrospective. Los Rios Community College District." ERIC Document 293580, 1988.

Palmer, Jim. "Assessing Institutional Effectiveness: Community College Case Studies." ERIC Document 292499, 1988.

Stuhr, Christian. "Fear and Guilt in Adult Education: A Personal Account of Investigations into Students Dropping Out." ERIC Document 285038, 1987.

Tichenor, Richard. "St. Louis Community College Nonreturning Students: Retention Problems or Success Stories." ERIC Document 287551, 1987.

Cumberland county college
P.O. BOX 517 VINELAND, NEW JERSEY 08360-0517

Survey of Nonreturning Students

Your opinions about your experience at Cumberland County College are important to us. Please take just a few minutes to respond to the items below. All information will be treated confidentially and anonymously.

Please check the box below that describes your status when you last enrolled at Cumberland County College:

(1) _____ Student taking course(s) for credit
(2) _____ Continuing education (non-credit) student
(3) _____ ROGATE or College for Kids student

What was your primary reason for enrolling at Cumberland County College originally? (check one)

(1) _____ to prepare for future employment
(2) _____ to improve skills useful in present job
(3) _____ to prepare for further education at a four-year college
(4) _____ to satisfy personal interest in specific areas
(5) _____ to open the opportunity to be with other people
(6) _____ to supplement a 4-year college program
(7) _____ other: please specify _____

How did you originally intend to accomplish the above stated goal? By enrolling (check one)

(1) _____ In selected courses full-time
(2) _____ In selected courses part-time
(3) _____ In a certificate program
(4) _____ In an associate degree program
(5) _____ In continuing education (workshops or short courses)
(6) _____ Other: please specify _____

If you were enrolled in a program, what is the name of the program?

_____

In what semester did you last enroll at Cumberland County College?

Semester: _____ Year: _____

In your last term at Cumberland County College, did you enroll (check one)

(1) _____ full-time (12 credits or more)
(2) _____ part-time (less than 12 credits)

If part-time, number of courses you took in your last term: _____

How well did each of the following Cumberland County College programs or services meet your individual needs? (Please circle one response for each item.)

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Didn't Know Existed	Knew of but did not use
Academic Advisement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Admissions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Financial Aid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Job Placement Assistance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Library	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Registration Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Student Activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Quality of Instruction in Major	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tutoring Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Learning Laboratory Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

NRS89-

Following is a list of possible reasons for not re-enrolling. Please rank the top three reasons you did not re-enroll. Use 1 for the most important reason, 2 for the second most important reason, and 3 for the third most important reason.

____ courses completed satisfied my personal needs
____ found job in occupation related to courses I took at Cumberland County College
____ transferred to another two-year college
____ transferred to a four-year college
____ currently attend four-year college
____ financial reasons
____ conflicting job hours
____ child care problems
____ parenthood
____ personal/family illness or injury
____ transportation problems
____ change in residence
____ attendance problems
____ grade problems
____ difficulty in readjusting to becoming a college student
____ lack of self confidence
____ lack of support from family/friends
____ lack of peer group support and friendliness
____ lack of support from instructors, counselors, or advisers
____ dissatisfied with course offerings
____ dissatisfied with content of courses
____ dissatisfied with instruction
____ dissatisfied with academic advisement
____ other: please specify _____

Please respond to each item below: (check one response for each item)

Sex: (1) ____ male (2) ____ female

Year of birth: _____

Marital Status:

(1) ____ single (3) ____ separated (5) ____ widowed
(2) ____ married (4) ____ divorced

Number of Dependents (not including yourself):

(1) ____ none (3) ____ three - four
(2) ____ one - two (4) ____ five or more

Race/Ethnic Group:

(1) ____ Black Non-Hispanic (4) ____ Asian or Pacific Islander
(2) ____ White Non-Hispanic (5) ____ American Indian/Alaskan Native
(3) ____ Hispanic (6) ____ Other

Employment Status:

(1) ____ full-time (4) ____ not employed outside of home
(2) ____ part-time (5) ____ have never been employed
(3) ____ unemployed

If employed part-time, how many hours do you work each week? _____

If not currently employed, number of years since last full-time employment: _____

Comments:

Thank you for your cooperation.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges AUG 25 1989